DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 056 FL 018 399

AUTHOR Wiley, Terrence G.; Fickle, B. J.
TITLE Reflecting on Teaching to Promote Academic Language Use in the Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Classroom.
PUB DATE Jun 89
NOTE 35p.; Produced under a grant from the California Academic Partnership Program by the Language and Content Enrichment Project.
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; Classroom Techniques; Cooperative Learning; *Cultural Differences; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); *Language Role; *Minority Groups; *Oral Language; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Student Centered Curriculum; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Role; Teaching Guides; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Academic Language; *Diversity (Student); Teacher Centered Instruction

ABSTRACT

This handbook for classroom teachers is motivated by the need to promote academic language use among students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. First, several works providing a rationale for using student-centered instructional practices as a means of promoting student learning are reviewed. The pitfalls of using teacher-centered strategies with some minority students are discussed, and models of instruction promoting active student learning through oral language use are described. Each section includes suggestions for further reading. A section on "Activities for Reflection" encourages teachers to consider how their own teaching philosophy and experience affects their classroom attitudes and behavior. A bibliography of over 120 resources is appended, with items relating to cooperative learning theories, strategies, and/or activities highlighted. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED317056

REFLECTING ON TEACHING TO PROMOTE ACADEMIC LANGUAGE USE IN THE CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE CLASSROOM

Prepared by

Terrence G. Wiley, Ph.D.

Co-director

Language and Content Enrichment Project

(A Project of the California Academic Partnership Program, CAPP)

With Assistance From

B.J. Fickle

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T.G. Wiley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

June, 1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This handbook was produced under a grant from the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP) by the Language and Content Enrichment Project (# 21). The project is solely responsible for the content of this document.

FL018399

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This handbook is motivated by the need to promote academic language use among students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. First, several works are reviewed which provide a rationale for using student-centered instructional practices as a means of promoting student learning. Next, the pitfalls using of teacher-centered strategies with some minority students is discussed; then, models of instruction which promote active student learning through oral language use are identified. Each major section is followed by suggestions for further reading. A section on "Activities for Reflection" to allow for consideration of how the information presented relates to the classrooms A bibliographic list of resources, through which the reflective practitioner can explore further some of the strategies and models discussed, is included at the end of this handbook.

THE EDUCATIONAL CHALLENGE OF DIVERSITY

What philosophers have got to do is work out a fresh analysis of the relations between the one and the many. Our shrinking world presents that issue today in a thousand different forms. Pluralism is the greatest philosophical idea of our times. How are we going to make the most of the new values we set on variety, difference, and individuality--how are we going to realize their possibilities in every field, and at the same time not sacrifice that plurality to the cooperation we need so much? How can we bring things together as we must without losing sight of plurality? There is an intellectual problem for philosophers to get busy upon!

John Dewey
[Dictionary of Education, p.102.]

REFLECTING ON TEACHING TO PROMOTE ACADEMIC LANGUAGE USE: THE CHALLENGE OF THE CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE CLASSROOM

Models of Instruction: Transmission Versus Active Participation

Every teacher is faced typically with two major instructional decisions regarding what content to teach and how best to teach it. Every experienced teacher knows that there are alternatives among instructional models given the backgrounds and needs of the learner and the aims of the school.

Traditionally, the dominant models of instruction have been motivated by what may be termed the *transmission* perspective of teaching and learning. There are several assumptions about the nature of knowledge and learning which underlie the transmission view. One is that knowledge exists *outside* of the mind of the student. Another is that it is a *fixed quantity* which can be *contained in* books or *in* the heads of teachers. Based upon these assumptions, the teacher's instructional role is seen as that of a *facilitator* in the transfer of content from books (or from his or her own head) *into* the head of the student. Consequently, the transmission view sees the teacher as the center of instruction.

Early in this century an alterative view of instruction placed the child at the center of the instructional stage. Advocates of the *child-as-center* argued that each individual child had a unique personal history which must be considered. New knowledge was added to and reconciled with the student's knowledge and experience. Sympathetic with this view, but also concerned with the transmission of social knowledge, John Dewey maintained that the broader social and political values of society were both *passed on to* and *reconstructed* by the student. For Dewey, each new generation had to reconcile knowledge from the past with its own experience in the present. The reconstruction of knowledge was, thus, never a mirror-image reproduction. Rather, it involved some adaptation and redefinition based upon the unique knowledge and experience of the individual child and his or her sub-cultural values and experiences.

Such a perspective might be termed *interactionalist*. On a micro or individual level, a student interacts with the curriculum, attempting to integrate it and reconcile it based upon prior personal knowledge. On a macro or cultural level, various sub-cultural groups interact with the dominant culture of the school.

From Communication to Curriculum

In his definitive study of language use in the classroom, *From Communication Curriculum*, Douglas Barnes argues that the analysis of different styles of discourse in both formal teacher/student interaction and in unstructured conversations is essential for understanding the relationship between curriculum and instructional communication. Since Barnes' work is representative of a growing body of research which analyzes academic discourse as a means of understanding why some students succeed when others fail, his conclusions are outlined below.

Barnes rejects the notion that some children fail merely because they have difficulty with language. Instead, he places blame on the traditional, formalized methods of the teacher-centered classroom. As an alternative to the rigid teaching practices of the transmission view, he proposes small group interaction which encourages students to assume responsibility for their own learning. Barnes notes that classrooms are social and cultural communication systems. However, they are systems which must attune themselves to and accommodate the increased diversity among the social and cultural systems of their student populations. He argues that it is impossible to separate content (the message) from instructional strategies (the medium) in deciding what to teach since to a great extent, the "medium is the message." This is because language underlies the communication system of the classroom; language is a means of learning for each individual student.

Given the increased diversity within the schools, Barnes notes it is difficult to envision a classroom where knowledge would be equally accessible to all students. For such a multicultural classroom to be created, it would have to "...accept as meaningful a far wider range of beliefs, understandings and values..." which reflect the sub-cultures of the students (p. 189).

Barnes maintains it is essential to consider both aspects of language. If, for example, we consider language from only the standpoint of the communication system, we run the risk of relegating the learner to the role of *passive recipient*

(which would be consistent with the transmission perspective). However, by considering language as a means of learning, the learner may become an *active participant* in the process of making meaning.

In summary, for knowledge to be made more accessible, two major shifts in educational thinking are needed. First, classrooms must be sensitive to and accommodating of the social and cultural backgrounds of all students. Second, student and teacher roles must be redefined in such a way that students become active participants in their own learning; teachers must become directors of classroom activities rather than actors on the center of the stage.

Why Opportunities for Oral Language Use are Necessary

Barnes argues that students must have opportunities to use language in order to learn and develop concepts. Citing Vygotsky's pioneering research (1962), Barnes maintains that *inner speech* for adults and *egocentric* speech for children are the most accessible parts of thought which make thinking and feeling open to introspection and which make learning possible. Young children tend to speak aloud to facilitate learning. Older learners experience an inner monologue or voice that comments, interprets and guides them. Often, when we meet a problem we want to discuss, it is "...as if the talking enables us to rearrange the problem so that we can look at it differently." Once we know what we know, we can change it (Barnes, 1976:19).

Thus, in the classroom it is necessary to consider language from the perspective of its function as a learning tool for the individual learner. The role of language must be understood in terms of (1) how students formulate and process information, (2) how they relate it to their previous knowledge, and (3) how they use it for own purposes. Barnes warns that if teachers are too intent to push their own (or the texts') interpretation, their intended pedagogical view may never come into a significant relationship with the student's interpretation. Thus, verbalization helps students to reflect on knowledge and to change it. Without such opportunities there is no opportunity for what Piaget has called accommodation, i.e., reconciling new knowledge with old knowledge (Barnes, 1976:19).

Formats for Oral Language Use in Classroom Interaction

Barnes' analysis has focused on the dynamics of the classroom communication system and small-group class discussion. While he favors small group interaction as a means of maximizing the student's opportunities for oral language use, he notes that the use of small-groups does not necessarily guarantee active participation nor maximum opportunities for oral language use.

He has identified what he calls two broad formats for small-group interaction which have produced different results in terms of student involvement:

> *Open Formats* use a hypothetical mode in which students ask questions of one another which invite interpretation and discussion. Statements are tentative, exploratory, and invite comment or elaboration from others. This approach requires a collaborative social relationship in which students must build upon the comments of others (Barnes, 1976:67). While this approach tends to encourage student involvement, it is important to note that Heath (1983) has found that in some cultures, young people are taught to take a literal stance toward text. Thus, some students may need to be overtly taught to take a hypothetical stance toward a discussion or point of view in a text.
>
> *Closed Formats* limit input from students to providing information which has been explicitly asked for. Students' questions are limited to requests for specific information. The two most common types of closed formats according to Barnes are (1) Consensus and (2) Ritual.
>
> *Consensus* formats place greater emphasis on having students and teachers maintain harmonious social relationships rather than on carrying out tasks or scrutinizing content. In consensus formats disagreement is seen a disruption or breakdown. Since multicultural classrooms must be open to a wide range of values and backgrounds, consensus formats may alienate students whose interpretations vary markedly from the majority.
>
> *Ritual* formats utilize questions and answers patterns which are so predictable that they become ritualized. There is little or no intellectual or moral engagement with the subject matter. Ritual formats run the risk of degenerating into a form of academic trivial pursuit.

Within the various formats students can assume either open or closed stances or orientations toward audience (an audience may be one's self, one's peers, the teacher, or a wider public; Barnes, 1976:68). The question arises as to what

determines whether learners take an open or a closed stance to an assignment or learning task. Barnes (1976:68-69) argues that neither the intelligence nor articulateness of the student determines which stance they will take. Rather, it appears that the more uncertain students are, of either the task or of their knowledge, the more likely they will be to used a closed approach. Predictably, the more public an exchange, the more likely students are to resort to closed-ritualized approaches.

Suggested Reading: Douglas Barnes' *Communication to Curriculum* (1976; Pelican Books), reviewed above, is perhaps the best single introduction to the relationship between communicative frameworks in the classroom and content.
Though written with the English-as-a Second Language teacher in mind, Keith Johnson's and Keith Morrow's (Eds.) *Communication in the Classroom* (1981; Longman), has a number of useful suggestions for the instruction of second language students.
John Dewey's *Education and Experience* (1938, reprinted by Macmillan, 1963) is a timeless classic and an eloquent justification for the need to link instruction to experience.

What Can Happen When Minority Students Aren't Allowed to be Active Learners?

While it may be argued that active student-centered instruction is desirable for most students, in certain contexts it may be essential. Dumont (1972), for example, studied the impact of the traditional teacher-centered instruction on Sioux and Cherokee students. He concluded that while the students understood and controlled much of the communicative environment, the manner by which teaching and learning were conducted by Anglo teachers using a transmission approach kept the Indian students from learning English and becoming literate. Teachers were frustrated in their attempts to get students to respond to their questions. Students frequently failed to answer and remained silent. According to Dumont:

> Education for most students is an either-or proposition: participate by teacher-school established norms or withdraw. It is either being able to speak English or silence .... [English] ... is the only viable means to get at ... academic subjects. However, the conditions of silence continue ... because the teacher knows virtually nothing about the Cherokee, neither their language nor their life styles. In the absence of that we can only speak about whether students do or do not talk in class, and to even suggest anything about the functions of language in discourse conversation, or dialogue within the classroom is useless, because it does not exist except on rare occasions. [Dumont, 1972:69]

In a study similar to Dumont's, Susan Philips (1986 & 1972) noted that Anglo teachers could either hinder or promote the participation of Indian children based upon the type of classroom communication model they selected as the means of instruction. Philips noted that there are several typical structures for language use which she calls "participant structures." Each participant structure requires a different social/communicative role for the teacher and students.

Philips found that there was cultural incongruity between patterns of interaction expected by Anglo teachers who used teacher-centered approaches with Indian children of the Warm Spring Reservation. Philips surmised that there are four major patterns of teacher/student interaction within the school:

(1) teacher interacts with all of the class;
(2) teacher interacts with only some of the class, as in a reading group;
(3) students work individually with teacher available for consultation;
(4) students work in small groups with distant teacher supervision. The first two patterns are more heavily teacher-centered than the last two.

Philips found that Warm Springs children were less likely to participate in the first two types of interaction. The third and forth patterns, which are more student-centered, were particularly effective. She observed that these structures of interaction approximated structures of interaction for learning and social participation within the Warm Springs Indian community. Warm Springs activities were generally community-wide (rather than individualistic). Normal participation in Indian activities was based upon "self-choice." No single individual "led" social

activities (as does the teacher in the school). Moreover, an individual in the community "learns" by means of "passive observation" and practice (as opposed to teacher directed drill and questioning) in isolation from the group. The Warm Springs learner "demonstrates" knowledge only when he or she feels that competence has been attained. Practice, which may result in error, is done only in private.

Since the two teacher-centered participant structures of the school require individual demonstration of competence prior to mastery, they were resisted by students who behaved in a manner which was consistent with the community practices of their reservation. Breakdowns in student /teacher interactions, which often occur, are the result of cultural differences regarding appropriate social behavior and learning styles.

Suggested Reading: For a variety of perspectives on the nature and importance of language use in academic settings, see Courtney Cazden *et al.* (Eds.) *Functions of Language in the Classroom* (1985 Waveland Press, Inc.). It includes a number useful articles including those discussed above by Dumont and Philips.
Though intended primarily for Bilingual educators and Teachers of English as a Second Language, Gail L. Nemetz Robinson's *Crosscultural understanding* (1985; Pergamon Press) is a valuable resource. It includes a section on obtaining cultural information for content instruction.
Jim Cummins' *Empowering Minority Students* (1989), while written largely as a defense of bilingual education, contains an important section entitled "Towards Anti-Racist Education: Empowering Minority Students," which presents a framework for cultural and linguistic incorporation and community participation.

MODELS OF INSTRUCTION WHICH PROMOTE STUDENT-CENTERED LEARNING AND LANGUAGE USE

As Barnes (1976) has indicated, to maximize learning opportunities for all students it is necessary to link content to instructional strategies. At a fundamental level of conceptualization, Joyce and Weil (1980) have identified four major families of instructional models. It is important to note that Joyce and Weil point out that these models are neither entirely pure nor mutually exclusive. The major families of models include:

> 1. *Informational-Processing Models* emphasize the ability of students to process and master information, organize data, generate concepts and solve academic problems (1980:9).
>
> 2. *Personal Models* focus on the psychological development and maturation of the individual and his or her orientation to the environment (1980: 9-11).
>
> 3. *Social Interaction Models* place emphasis on improving the student's ability to relate to others, participate in democratic processes, negotiate viewpoints, while also placing emphasis on academic subjects and the development of the student's general intellectual development. These models are based largely upon the work of Dewey and his followers (1980: 11).
>
> 4. *Behavior Models* which are derived from behavioral theory are intended to make an observable change in the behavior of students. Behavioral theories tend to break down learning into a series of discrete, sequenced behaviors based upon principles of stimulus control and reinforcement (1980:11-13).

Joyce and Weil have analyzed these models in terms of their instructional and affective or nurturant effects. While all of the various instructional families are beneficial and appropriate in certain contexts, a number of the models in the social family lend themselves to the goals of promoting active learning and increased academic language use within the pluralistic classroom.

THE SOCIAL FAMILY OF MODELS: MODELS WHICH FACILITATE COMMUNICATION AND ACADEMIC INQUIRY WITHIN THE PLURALISTIC CLASSROOM

Below, salient features of several of the social instructional models are summarized according to their general instructional and affective characteristics, instructional sequence, social environment, role of the teacher, and application/relationship with content.

1. Social Studies Inquiry Model

Characteristics

The inquiry model emphasizes an open climate of discussion which accepts all points of view, an emphasis on a hypothetical point of view, and an atmosphere of negotiation. The classroom is organized for the analysis of facts to test hypothesis about social problems (Joyce & Weil, 1980:312-314).

Instructional Sequence

Sensitization to a problem or dilemma and formation of a general statement of the problem.
Formation of a hypothesis which serves as a guide for further inquiry.
Definition and clarification of key terms in the hypothesis.
Exploration of the logical validity and internal consistency of the hypothesis.
Testing the factual accuracy of the hypothesis.
Drawing conclusions or generalization of the merits of a hypothesis or the relative merits of several.

Social Environment

The environment is moderately structured with the teacher keeping students on task as they move from phase to phase. Students should assume the major responsibility for the inquiry. Inquiry should be leisurely and open among equals (Joyce & Weil, 1980:.

Teacher's Role

The teacher should assume the role of a sharpener, focuser, and counselor rather than an instructor (Joyce & Weil, 1980:317)

Application/Relationship with Content

According to Joyce and Weil (1980:317-318) the textbook can be a prime source for identifying dilemma's for inquiry. Students are encouraged to shift their stance toward the text as the place where all the answers are found to the text as a starting point for further inquiry and the testing of interpretations and hypothesis.

2. Jurisprudential Model (recommended for advanced students)

Characteristics

This model assumes that people legitimately differ in their values and priorities and that negotiation and conflict resolution are skills which can be taught.

Instructional Sequence

Students are presented with a controversial topic found in a story, historical narrative or film, and review relevant facts.

Students synthesize the topic into a policy issue and identify the values and inherent conflicts involved (e.g., rights of the individual versus rights of the community, freedom of speech versus the right to privacy, local control versus federal control etc.).

Students are asked to take a position on the issue and state their reasons.

Students are questioned and asked to defend their positions (the teacher uses a Socratic style). The teacher may attempt to clarify values or attempt to have students set priorities or predict the consequences of their policy positions.

Students are then asked to redefine or qualify their positions based upon worst case scenarios.

Students can also test the factuality of their claims (Joyce & Weil, 1980:27-21).

Social Environment

The social environment in this model ranges from high to low. The teacher keeps students on task from phase to phase.

Teacher's Role
The teacher's stance should not be evaluative in terms of showing approval or disapproval but should only probe content. Using the Socratic style, there is danger that students will be threatened by what they perceive as interrogation. The trick for the teacher is to assume the role of a consultant who is trying to help the students develop the most convincing case possible. Consequently, the teacher is helping the student to anticipate weakness in the case. If the teacher is seen as a co-problem solver rather than an evaluator, students are more likely to respond positively to assuming a critical stance toward their own work.

Application/Relationship with Content
According to Joyce and Weil, source documents should be selected for students to analyze which are linked to an initial controversial problem such as a historical or legal situation (e.g., *Plessy v. Ferguson*). Works of literature such as Orwell's *Animal Farm* can also be used

3. Group Investigation Model (Joyce & Weil, 1980:226-240)

Characteristics
Herbert Thelen's Group Investigation model follows John Dewey's (1916, *Democracy in Education*, NY: Macmillan). The intent is twofold: The intention of the model is to combine democratic process with the process of academic inquiry. Dewey argued that if a democratic citizenry is the goal of education, the classroom and the school must provide a social system which provides practice in those processes. The classroom is seen as a small society. The second motivation for the model is to use academic inquiry to go beyond the textbook. In history and the social sciences, for example, while textbooks are rich in factual information, they fail to help students understand the feelings and attitudes of the times they are studying. Consequently, there is a need to go beyond the text. The basic formula is that inquiry promotes knowledge and that the "teachable group" is the appropriate social unit for learning.

Instructional Sequence
Encounter or confrontation with a puzzling situation problem or issue.
Exploration of reactions to the problem.
Formulate a study task and assign roles for inquiry.

Social Environment
The teacher attempts to participate in the developing "house rules," i.e., activities which promote a social order which is conducive to learning. Those rules are the methods and attitudes of the subject matter which is taught.

Teacher's Role
The teacher poses problems or situations which promote further inquiry and participates in establishing the rules of inquiry. The role of the teacher is thus that of "counselor, consultant, and friendly critic" (p.237).

Application/Relationship with Content
Group investigation provides a means of going beyond the textbook. Problems or issues posed in the text can be the starting point for further inquiry. Joyce and Weil (1980:238) warn that "If students have not had an opportunity to experience the kind of social interaction, decision making, and independent inquiry called for in this model, it may take some time before they function at a high level." This does not have to be seen as a negative, however, since part of what is being learned relates not only to content but also to process. Students who learn how to undertake further inquiry in cooperation with others will be better prepared for more advanced study.

Suggested Reading: For examples of actual lessons, a more detailed reading of Joyce and Weil's *Models of Teaching* (1980) is recommended. See in particular "Part III: The Social Family."

COOPERATIVE LEARNING AS A CLASSROOM FRAMEWORK FOR MAXIMIZING ACTIVE LEARNING AND ORAL LANGUAGE USE

In recent years, cooperative learning strategies have been hailed as addressing several concerns raised above. To begin with cooperative learning strategies are student-centered. These strategies maximize the opportunity for all the students to participate regardless of their level of ability. They also allow students to learn from and about each other. When using cooperative learning, cultural and individual differences can become starting points for exploration of ideas and for learning social cooperation in spite of difference. Many of these strategies are compatible with the social family of instructional models identified above.

Kagan (1986), who has become the foremost spokesperson for cooperative learning, maintains that a teacher's selection of one learning strategy (or participant structure in Philips' terms) over another may have positive academic and social benefits for some groups more than others. Cooperative approaches have been

found to be more beneficial than traditional individualistic approaches for Mexican-American, Black, Asian, and Native American students, and they have also proved beneficial for promoting gains among low income Anglo students. Moreover, greater inter-ethnic cooperation has been noted among all students when cooperative methods have been used within the multi-ethnic classroom. When more individualistic/competitive methods have been used fewer gains and less inter-group cooperation have been noted.

Kagan (1986:242-243) outlines five frameworks for cooperative learning:

> *Peer Tutoring* methods are used to help teams of students master *predetermined* content. Team members drill each other using worksheets and flash cards. These methods are seen as being appropriate for low difficulty, high consensus, tasks (e.g., related to spelling and math).
>
> *Jigsaw* requires a division of labor in which each member of a team has responsibility for a portion of a task. Jigsaw methods, thus, foster interdependence. Members then leave their initial group and instruct students in other groups. Jigsaw may involve some drill but is designed to promote more information sharing than peer tutoring. Consequently, it is more appropriately used with medium-consensus, medium-difficulty academic tasks (e.g., social studies or social science materials).
>
> *Cooperative Projects* involve group planning and coordinated effort to produce a paper, product (e.g., a mural) or make a group presentation. Students are graded as a group rather than individually. Cooperative projects are most appropriate for low-consensus, complex academic context. A great deal of control is placed in the hands of the learner's who must determine both the content and method of study.
>
> *Cooperative/Individualized* methods allow students to work at their own rate within a group. While team members work with and tutor each other, and receive a group grade, learning units are designed to be largely self-explanatory. Consequently, students work mostly alone.
>
> *Cooperative Interaction* involves allowing students to work as a team while receiving individual grades. Unlike Jigsaw, all students have equal access to and responsibility for learning materials. This approach is also distinguished from cooperative/individualized in that assignments are group-paced.

Cooperative learning strategies have a great potential to engage students in active learning and to allow students the maximum opportunity for oral language use. For suggested readings on cooperative learning and related strategies, see entries marked "CL" in the bibliography.

Suggested Reading: For an overview of the application of cooperative learning strategies see Kagan's "Cooperative Learning and Sociocultural Factors in Schooling, in *Beyond Language: Social and Cultural Factors in Schooling Language Minority Students* (1986; Published and Disseminated by Evaluation, Dissemination & Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles).

For a practical classroom guide see Kagan's "Cooperative Learning: Resources for Teachers"(1988; Printing and Reprographics, University of California Riverside). See also R. Slavin, S. Sharan, S., Kagan, S., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Webb, C. and Schmuck, R. (Eds.) *Learning to cooperate, cooperating to learn* (1985); Plenum).

ACTIVITIES FOR REFLECTION

The following exercises are designed to promote reflection on aspects of your teaching philosophy and experience. Realistically, much of what we teachers would like to do, from an ideal point of view, is not possible given the normal demands of our jobs and constraints imposed by the institutions in which we work. Never-theless, reflection on practice can job our memories and help us recall methods or techniques which have fallen into disuse, and help us to be open to new strategies which improve our professional skills.

How would you assess your own orientation toward instruction? Is your classroom more teacher-centered or more student-centered.

___ Mostly Teacher-centered

___ A Blend (somewhat teacher-centered & somewhat student-centered)

___ Mostly Student-centered

Briefly describe those aspects of your teaching which you feel make you mostly teacher-centered or student-centered. For example, what opportunities do students have to participate, offer their own interpretations, and choose topics of inquiry? To what extent are both topics and methods of inquiry determined solely by the teacher? Explain and give examples below.

Generally, what percent of classroom time is spent on the following:

____ % Lecture
____ % Teacher-lead Discussion
____ % Small Group Discussion
____ % Individualized Presentations
____ % Silent Study
____ % Worksheet Completion
____ % Other _____

Which of the following do you tend agree with more and stress in your teaching?

____ The students need to understand the interpretation of the text. Since they generally lack information, it is essential that they understand the text's point of view.

____ The students need to formulate their own interpretations. The text's interpretation should be a starting point for discussion.

____ A priority is placed on covering the material; digressions are discouraged.

____ Although covering the material is a priority, digression are permitted if the it appears that there will be some pedagogical value in entertaining it.

____ While themes and topics are selected by the teacher, students are allowed to determine the specific direction which classroom discussion and inquiry takes.

____ Other. Explain Below:

How do you typically structure classroom discussions? Based upon Barnes' categories, are you more likely to use *open formats* or *closed formats?* Explain below:

What do you see the strengths and weaknesses of using *closed formats* to be? Of *open formats*? Explain below.

When you use closed formats, are they more likely to involve *ritual* or *consensus?* Explain below:

What reactions from students have you noticed when you use *closed formats*? For example, do some students tend to dominate the interaction while others attempt to avoid engagement? When some students dominate discussion, what adjustments do you make? Explain below.

What experiences have you had with students who are non-native speakers of English and who may have been reluctant to speak or participate? What was your analysis of the situation? What solutions in dealing with the situation could you share with colleagues? What further assistance do you feel you need in working with non-native speakers of English? Explain below.

When you have had linguistic and cultural minority students in your class, which types of participant structures identified by Philips have you used as structures for communication in the classroom.

____ (1) teacher interacts with all of the class;

____ (2) teacher interacts with only some of the class, as in a reading group;

____ (3) students work individually with teacher available for consultation;

____ (4) students work in small groups with distant teacher supervision. The first two patterns are more heavily teacher-centered than the last two.

Which have been the most successful? Were the various structures equally successful for all types of students? Explain below.

When you have had students from cultures that are significantly different from your own, what have been some of your concerns? below.

___ Lack of knowledge about the student's cultural practices and values.

___ Lack of understanding about the students' previous educational background.

___ Difficulty in understanding the students' speech.

___ Difficulty in understanding the students' writing.

___ Difficulty in getting the students to respond to classroom expectations.

___ Difficulty in getting the students to interact with other students.

___ Other. Explain:

When you have had students from cultures that are significantly different from your own, what strategies or steps have you taken to learn about those cultures that you could share with colleagues? Explain below.

Based upon the descriptions of the models of instruction (information processing, personal, social inquiry, and behavioral), which seem to come closest to your own orientation? Explain below.

If you teach history or social studies courses, what do you see the possible strengths or weakness of the social inquiry model to be? To what extent have you used it. What possibilities do you see for adapting it if you do not use it? Explain below.

What experience with cooperative learning strategies have you had? How frequently have you used some of the strategies and with what success? What additional information about cooperative learning strategies would you like? Explain below.

Cummins (1989:58) cites four institutional characteristics which are designed to enable minority students to participate fully within the educational process. For each of the following, briefly comment on the extent to which these characteristics are incorporated within your school.

1. minority students' language and culture are incorporated into the school program;

Comment:

2. minority community participation is encouraged as an integral component of children's education;

Comment:

3. the pedagogy promotes intrinsic motivation on the part of students to use language actively in order to generate their own knowledge;

Comment:

4. professionals involved in assessment (of language and academic ability) become advocates for minority students by focusing primarily on the ways in which students' academic difficulty is a function of interactions within the school context rather than legitimizing the location of the "problem" within the students.

Comment:

Bibliography

Compiled by B.J. Fickle

Entries which relate to Cooperative Learning theories, strategies and/or activities are followed by the notation **CL.**

Animal Town Game Company (1984). *The Animal Town Game Company Catalog of Board Games*. Santa Barbara, CA: Animal Town Game Company. **CL**

Aronson, E., Balney, N., Stephan, C., Sikes, J., & Snapp, M. (1978). *The jigsaw classroom*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **CL**

Barnes, D. (1973). Classroom contexts for language and learning. *Educational Review, 23,* 235-47.

Barnes, D. (1973). *Language in the classroom*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Barnes, D. (1976). *From communication to curriculum.* Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton Book Publications.

Barnes, D., Britton, J., & Rosen, H. (1969). *Language, the learner and the school.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Barnes, D., & Todd, F. (1975). *Communication and learning in small groups.* Routledge & Kegan Paul. **CL**

Bellack, A., Kleibard, H., Hyman, R., & Smith, F. (1966). *The language of the classroom*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Berman, P., & McLanghin, M. (1978). *Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VIII : Implementing and sustaining innovations.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Blumenfeld, P., Hamilton, V., Bossert, S., Wessel, K., & Muce, J. (1983). Teacher talk and student thought. In J. Levine & M. Waug (Eds.), *Teacher and student perceptions : Implications for learning*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Britton, J. N. (1970). *Language and learning.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Caplan, R., & Keech, C. (1980). *Showing writing: A training program to help students to be specific.* Berkeley, CA: University of California, Bay Area Writing Project. **CL**

Cashdan, A., & Grugeon, E. (Eds.). (1972). *Language in education.* Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Cazden, C. B., John, V. P., & Hymes, D. (1972). *Functions of language in the classroom.* Teacher's College Press, Columbia University. Reissued (1985) by Waveland Press, Inc.

Chasnoff, R. (Ed.) (1979). *Structuring cooperative learning experiences in the classroom : The 1979 handbook.* Minneapolis, MN: Cooperative Network Publication. **CL**

Co-operative College of Canada (1980). *Co-operative outlooks.* Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada: Co-operative College of Canada. **CL**

Cohen, E. G. (1980). Groupwork for the integrated classroom. *Stanford University Status Equalization Project*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University School of Education. **CL**

Cohen, R. S. (Ed.) (1973) *Language and cognition.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cook-Gumperz, J., Gumperz J., and Simons, H. (1981). *School-Home Ethnography Project: Final report to the National Institute of Education.* Washinton, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students.* Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Deacove, J. (1974). *Cooperative games manual.* Perth, Ontario, Canada: Family Pastimes. **CL**

Deacove, J. (1974). *Sports manual of co-operative recreation*. Perth, Ontario, Canada: Family Pastimes. **CL**

Deutsch, M. (1962). Cooperation and trust: some theoretical notes. In M.R Jones (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press. **CL**

DeVries, D., & Edwards, K. (1973). Learning games and student teams: Their effects on classroom process. *American Educational Research Journal, 10,* 307-318. **CL**

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* Reprinted (1963). New York: MacMillan.

Dishon, D., & O'Leary, P. W. (1985). *A guidebook for cooperative learning: A technique for creating more effective schools.* Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications, Inc. **CL**

Dixon, J. (1967). *Growth through English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dixon, J. (1975). *Growth through English : set in the perspective of the seventies.* Oxford University Press.

Early, M., Thew, C.,& Wakefield, P. (1985). *ESL instruction via the regular curriculum: A framework and resource book*. Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: Ministry of Education, British Columbia.

Edwards, A. D., & Furlong, V. (1978). *The language of teaching*. London: Heinemann.

Eisner, E. W. (1982). *Cognition and curriculum: A basis for deciding what to teach.* New York: Longman.

Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (Eds). (1982). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longman.

Fluegelman, A. (Ed.). (1976). *The new games book.* New York: Dolphin/Doubleday. **CL**

Gallagher, J., Nuthall, J., & Rosenshine, B. (1970). *Classroom interaction research*. AERA Monograph No. 6.

Gartner, A., Kohnler, M. C., & Riessman, F. (1971). *Children teach children: Learning by teaching.* New York: Harper & Row. **CL**

Gibbs, J., & Allen, A. (1978). *Tribes: A process for peer involvement.* Oakland, CA: Center-Source Publications. **CL**

Gillham, B. (Ed.). (1986). *The language of school subjects.* London: Heinemann Educational Books Limited.

Gilmore, P., & Glatthorn, A. (Eds.). *Children in and out of school: Ethnography and education*. Washinton, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Glassman, M., Kisiow, E., Good, L., O'Connor, M., Alderson, I., & Kutz, S. (1980). *Cooperation and community life.* Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada: Co-operative College of Canada. **CL**

Graves, N. B., & Graves, T. D. (1983). The cultural context of prosocial development: An ecological model. In D. Bridgeman (Ed.), *The nature of prosocial development: Interdisciplinary theories and strategies.* New York: Academic Press. **CL**

Green, J. (1983). Exploring classroom discourse: Linguistic perspectives on teaching-learning processes. *Educational Psychologist, 18*, 180-199.

Green, J., & Wallat, C. (Eds). (1981). *Ethnography and language in educational settings*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Harrison, M. (1975). *For the fun of it! Selected cooperative games for children and adults.* Philadelphia, PA: Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends. **CL**

Healey, M. K. (1980). *Using student response groups in the classroom.* Berkeley, CA: University of California, Bay Area Writing Project. **CL**

Heath, S. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Herber, H. (Ed.). (1965). *Developing study skills in secondary schools.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Hill, W. F. (1977). *Learning thru discussion: Guide for leaders and members of discussion groups.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **CL**

Johnson, D. W. (1981). *Reaching out: Interpersonal effectiveness and self-actualization* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. (1975) *Learning together and alone: Cooperation, competition, and individualization.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. **CL**

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. (1978). Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 12,* 3-15. **CL**

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. (1979). Conflict in the classroom: Controversy and learning. *Review of Educational Research, 49,* 51-70. **CL**

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. (1982). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. **CL**

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. (1983). The socialization and achievement crisis: Are cooperative learning experiences the solution? In L. Bickman (Ed.), *Applied Social Psychology Annual, 4.*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **CL**

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., Holubec, E. J., & Roy, P. (1984). *Circles of learning.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. **CL**

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., & Maruyama, G. (1983). Interdependence and interpersonal attraction among heterogeneous and homogeneous individuals: A theoretical formulation and a meta-analysis of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 53,* 5-54. **CL**

Johnson, D. W., Maruyama, G., Johnson, R., Nelson, D., & Skon, L. (1981). Effects of cooperative, competitive and individualistic goal structures on achievement: A meta-analysis. *Psychology Bulletin, 89,* 47-62. **CL**

Johnson, K. & Morrow, K. (Eds.) (1981).*Communication in the classroom.* Essex: Longman.

Johnson, R. T., & Johnson, D. W. (Eds.). (1984). *Structuring cooperative learning: Lesson plans for the teacher.* Minneapolis, MN: Interaction Book Company. **CL**

Joyce, B. & Weil, M. (1981). *Models of teaching*, 2nd Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kagan, S. (1988). "Cooperative Learning: Resources for Teachers." Riverside, CA: Printing and Reprographics, University of California Riverside.

Kramsch, C. J. (1981). Discourse analysis and second language teaching. *Language in Education, 37.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Kramsch, C. J. (1981). Teaching discussion skills: A pragmatic approach. *FLA,14,* 93-104.

Kramsch, C. J. (1983). Interaction in the classroom: Learning how to negotiate roles and meaning. *Unterrichtspraxis, 2,* 175-90.

Longstreet, W. (1978). *Ethnicity: Understanding differences in pluralistic classrooms.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Lyons, V. (Ed.). (1980). *Structuring cooperative learning experiences in the classroom: The 1980 handbook.* Minneapolis, MN: Cooperative Network Publication. **CL**

Marland, M. (1977). *Language across the curriculum*. London: Heinemann.

Michaelis, B. & Michaelis, D. (1977). *Learning through noncompetitive activities and play*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Handbooks, Pitman Learning. **CL**

Moffett, J. (1968). *Teaching the universe of discourse*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Mohan, B. A. (1976). Discourse, context and languages for specialized purposes. In L. Trimble (Ed.), *Languages for specialized purposes*. Stuttgart: Fourth International Congress of Applied Linguistics.

Mohan, B. A. (1986). *Language and content.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Moorman, C. & Dishon, D. (1983). *Our classroom: We can learn together.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. **CL**

Neale, D. C., Bailey, W. J., & Ross, B. E. (1981). *Strategies for school improvement: Cooperative planning and organization development.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc. **CL**

O'Malley, M. (1982). *Children's English and service study. Educational needs assessment of language minority children with limited English proficiency.* Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Orlick, T. (1975). *Every kid can win.* Chicago, IL: Nelson Hall Publishers. **CL**

Orlick, T. (1977). *Winning through cooperation: Competitive insanity ; cooperative alternatives.* Washington, DC: Hawkins & Associates, Publishers. **CL**

Orlick, T. (1978). *The cooperative sports & games book: Challenge without competition.* New York: Pantheon. **CL**

Orlick, T. (1982). *The second cooperative sports and games book.* New York: Pantheon. **CL**

Philips, S. U. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation.* New York: Longman.

Porter, R. & Samovar, L. (1976). Communicating interculturally. In R. Porter & L. Samovar (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader.* Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth Press.

Portrier, G. A. (1970). *Students as partners in team learning.*Portrier, G. A. (1970). *Students as partn* of Team Learning. **CL**

Prosser, M. (1978). *The cultural dialogue.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Prutzman, P. (1978). *The friendly classroom for a small planet.* Wayne, NJ: Avery Publishing Group, Inc. **CL**

Raths, L. E., Harmin, M., & Simon, S. B. (1966). *Values and teaching: Working with values.* Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill. **CL**

Redduck, J. & Hopkins, D. (Eds.). (1985). *Research as a basis for teaching: Readings from the work of Lawrence Stenhouse.* London: Heineman Educational Books Ltd.

Richards, J. (1978). *Classroom language: What sort?* Unwin Educational.

Ripich, D. N. & Spinelli, F. M. (Eds.). (1985). *School discourse problems.* San Diego, CA: College Hill Press.

Rivers, W. M. (Ed.). (1987). *Interactive language teaching.* Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Robinson, G. L. N., (1985). *Crosscultural understanding: Processes and approaches: Processes and approaches for foreign language, English as a second language and bilingual educators.* NY: Pergamon Press.

Robinson, G. L. (1978). *Language and multicultural education. An Australian perspective.* Sydney: Australian and New Zealand Book Company.

Roy, P. (Ed.). (1982). *Structuring cooperative learning experiences in the classroom: The 1982 handbook.* Minneapolis, MN: Interaction Books. **CL**

Saskatchewan Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development. (1983). *Working together, learning together.* Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada: The Stewart Resource Center. **CL**

Saville-Troike, M. (1978). *A guide to culture in the classroom.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Saville-Troike, M. (1979). Culture, language, and education. In H. T. Trueba & C. Barnett-Miarahi (Eds.). (1979). *Bilingual multicultural education and the professional: From theory to practice*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Schmuck, R. A., Chesler, M., & Lippit, R. (1966). *Problem solving to improve classroom learning.* Chicago, IL: Science Research Associates. **CL**

Schmuck, R. A., & Schmuck, P. A. (1974). *A humanistic psychology on education. Making school everybody's house.* Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing. **CL**

Schmuck, R. A. & Schmuck, P. A. (1983). *Group processes in the classroom.* Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown. **CL**

Schwartz, M. N., Steefel, Q., & Schmuck, R. A. (1976). *The development of educational teams.* Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management. **CL**

Sharan, S. (1980). Cooperative learning in small groups: Recent methods and effects on achievement, attitudes, and ethnic relations. *Review of Educational Research, 50,* 241-271. **CL**

Sharan, S., Hare, P., Webb, C. D., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (Eds.). (1980). *Cooperation in education.* Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press. **CL**

Sharan, S., Hare, P., Webb, C. D., and Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (Eds.). (1980) *Cooperation in the classroom.* Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press. **CL**

Sharan, S., Kussell, P., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Bejarano, Y., Raviv, S., & Sharan, Y. (1984). *Cooperative learning in the classroom: Research in desegregated schools.* New York: Erlbaum. **CL**

Sharan, S. & Sharan, Y. (1976) *Small-group teaching.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications. **CL**

Simon, S. B., Howe, L. W., & Kirschenbaum, H. (1972). *Values clarification: A handbook of practical strategies for teachers and students.* New York: Hart Publishing Company, Inc. **CL**

Sinclair, J. M. & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Slavin, R. E. (1980). Cooperative learning. *Review of Educational Research, 50,* 315-342. **CL**

Slavin, R. E. (1983). *Cooperative learning.* New York: Longman. **CL**

Slavin, R. E. (1983). When does cooperative learning increase student achievement? *Psychological Bulletin, 94,* 429-445. **CL**

Slavin, R., Sharan, S., Kagan, S., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Webb, C. and Schmuck, R. (Eds.). (1985) *Learning to cooperate, cooperating to learn.* New York: Plenum. **CL**

Sobel, J. (1983). *Everybody wins: 393 non-competitive games for young children.* New York: Walker. **CL**

Spindler, G. (Ed.). (1974). *Education and cultural process.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Spradley, J. (1972). Foundations of cultural knowledge. In J. Spradley (Ed.), *Culture and cognition.* San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Stanford, G. (1969). *Learning discussion skills through games*. New York: Citation Press. **CL**

Stanford, G. (1977). *Developing effective classroom groups.* New York: Hart Publishing Company, Inc. **CL**

Stubbs, M. (1976). *Language, schools, and classrooms: Contemporary sociology of the school*. London: Methuen.

Thompson, J. (1969). *Instructional communication*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Torbe, M. (1979). Language and learning in the secondary school. In A. Cashdan (Ed.), *Language, reading and learning*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Vacha, E. F. (1977). *Improving classroom social climate.* Orcutt, CA: Orcutt Union School District. **CL**

Wallerstein, N. (1983). *Language and culture in conflict*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Weinstein, M. & Goodman, J. (1980). *Playfair: Everybody's guide to non-competitive play.* San Luis Obispo, CA: Impact. **CL**

Wheeler, R. & Ryan, F. (1973). Effects of cooperative and competitive environments on the attitudes and achievement of elementary school students engaged in social studies inquiry activities". *Journal of Educational Psychology, 65,* 403-407. **CL**

Wilkinson, L. C. (Ed.). (1982). *Communicating in the classroom.* New York: Academic Press.

Wynn, R. & Guditus, C. W. (1984). *Team management: Leadership by consensus.* Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merril Publishing. **CL**